

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

GREGORY B. SULLIVAN, et al.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	2:22-cv-00147-JDL
)	
CHESTER WATER AUTHORITY, et al.,)	
)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**ORDER ACCEPTING THE RECOMMENDED DECISION OF THE
MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Gregory B. Sullivan, who is proceeding *in forma pauperis*, brought this action in May 2022 against the Chester Water Authority, his former employer, and over sixty other Defendants. (ECF No. 1.) Sullivan asserts federal constitutional and statutory claims, as well as related state law claims, arising from an alleged pattern of deprivation of benefits and discrimination against him by the Defendants. He purports to bring these claims on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated persons.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 1915(e)(2) (West 2022), United States Magistrate Judge John C. Nivison conducted a preliminary review of Sullivan's Complaint and filed his Recommended Decision with the Court on July 22, 2022 (ECF No. 11),

pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 636(b)(1)(B) (West 2022) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).¹ The time within which to file objections has expired, and no objections have been filed. The Magistrate Judge provided notice that a party's failure to object would waive the right to *de novo* review and appeal.

I have reviewed and considered the Recommended Decision, together with the entire record, and I have made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge. I concur with the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in his Recommended Decision and determine that no further proceeding is necessary.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 11) of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **ACCEPTED** and Sullivan's Complaint (ECF No. 1) is **DISMISSED**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated this 31st day of August, 2022.

/s/ Jon D. Levy
CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ As part of his Recommended Decision, the Magistrate Judge (1) granted Sullivan's motion to amend the text of his Complaint to correct a date (ECF No. 10) and (2) denied Sullivan's motion to receive electronic copies of all documents filed electronically (ECF No. 9).